Case 2:11-cv-07159-TON Document 1 Filed 11/16/11 Page 1 of 9

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS					
TERESA SEGO		NCO FINANCIA	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.					
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant					
	nme, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	NOTE: IN LANI	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE					
Craig Thor Kimmel, E		LAND I	INVOLVED.					
Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike	P.C.	Attorneys (If Known)						
Ambler, PA 19002								
(215) 540-8888		+						
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES					
U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	P	PTF DEF PTF DEF					
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	izen of Another State					
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In	Another State				
		Citizen or Subject of a						
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	Foreign Country						
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES				
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment		620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other TABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☑ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of				
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights an "X" in One Box Only)	465 Other Immigration Actions	Parced from	State Statutes Appeal to District				
	ate Court Appellate Court	Reopened anothe		iet 🗇 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Cite the U.S. Ciyil Statute under which you and 15 U.S. CSECTION 1692 Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices Advanced in the collection of the collec		a statutes unless diversity):	<u> </u>				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:				
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE	1	DOCKET NUMBER					
Explanation:		5	_					
DATE 11-1(0-	SIGNAȚURE OI	FATTORNEY OF RECORD						
11 10	1.3							

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: 2519 Kenhill Drive Bowie, MD	20715
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Road, Horsham,	PA 19044
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	
(Use Reverse Side For Ad	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation an	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes No No
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	ar previously terminated action in this court?
	Yes□ No 🗹
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su action in this court?	nit pending or within one year previously terminated
determ in the court.	Yes No V
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier nu	imbered case pending or within one year previously
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No ✓
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?
	Yes No
CIVII. (Discos A in ONIC CATECORY ONI V)	
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. □ Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please
	specify)
7. □ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. \$169Z	
(Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTI	FICATION
(Check Appropriate Cat	regory)
I, Cara Nor Kimmel, counsel of record do hereby certify Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and by	v. belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	,
□ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 11-16-11	57160
Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	Attorney I.D.# e has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or wexcept as noted above.	vithin one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE: 11-16-11	57100
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

Case 2:11-cv-07159-TON Document 1 Filed 11/16/11 Page 3 of 9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Teresa Sego	<u>:</u>	CIVIL ACTION				
v.	:					
NCO Financial Systems,	Inc.	NO.				
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverside of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding set designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the trate to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.						
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOW	WING CASE MANAC	GEMENT TRACKS:				
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought	under 28 U.S.C. § 224	41 through § 2255.				
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.						
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)						
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.						
715-540-8888 8-	77-788-2864					
Telephone F	AX Number	E-Mail Address				

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 TERESA SEGO, 4 Plaintiff 5 Case No.: v. 6 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR 7 **JURY TRIAL** 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 COMPLAINT 11 TERESA SEGO ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, 12 P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"): 13 INTRODUCTION 14 Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 1. 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 16 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 17 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 18 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 19 20 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 21 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 22 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 23 and as such, personal jurisdiction is established. 24 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). 25

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Bowie, Maryland.
- 6. Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 8. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. Beginning in March 2011, and continuing through September 2011, Defendant and others it retained constantly and continuously placed harassing and abusive collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt of another person.
- 11. Upon information and belief, the debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 12. Defendant and its employees harassed Plaintiff by making continuous and repeated telephone calls to her home telephone.
- 13. Plaintiff does not owe the debt that Defendant was seeking to collect and is not the person whom Defendant was seeking to contact.
- 14. In March 2011, during her initial telephone conversation with Defendant, Plaintiff informed Defendant that she was not the person that it was looking for and that the telephone number it was calling did not belong to the person that owed the debt.

15.	During	this	same	call,	Plaintiff	instructed	Defendant	to	stop	calling	her	ir
connection with this debt.												

- 16. Despite Plaintiff's unambiguous request that Defendant stop calling, and her statement that she was not the person that Defendant was looking for, Defendant continued to contact Plaintiff on a repetitive and continuous basis in an attempt to collect a consumer debt of another person.
- 17. For approximately the first three months that Defendant was calling Plaintiff, Defendant contacted her, on average, twice per day.
- 18. Thereafter, the frequency of Defendant's calls escalated to the point where Plaintiff was receiving as many as ten (10) calls in a single day from Defendant, causing her to ultimately retain counsel to get the calls to stop.
- 19. With the exception of its initial telephone call to Plaintiff, the remainder of all Defendant's collection calls to Plaintiff were an automated recording.
 - 20. Plaintiff was unable to speak with a live person.
- 21. Further, in each recorded message, Defendant disclosed to Plaintiff that it was attempting to collect a debt from another person.
- 22. Most recently, on September 23, 2011, Defendant contacted Plaintiff at 8:30 a.m., 10:00 a.m., and 10:15 a.m.
- 23. Defendant failed to investigate or verify contact information prior to and after calling Plaintiff.
 - 24. Defendant failed to update its records to avoid further harassment of Plaintiff.
- 25. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy.

CONSTRUCTION OF LAW

- 26. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 27. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 28. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection

Case 2:11-cv-07159-TON Document 1 Filed 11/16/11 Page 8 of 9

practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. <u>Clomon</u>, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 29. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692b(2) of the FDCPA when it stated to Plaintiff that it was attempting to collect a debt;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692b(3) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff more than once;
 - d. Defendant violated §1692c(b) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff about another person's debt;
 - e. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
 - f. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring, and engaged Plaintiff in conversation repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff; and
 - g. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt.

Case 2:11-cv-07159-TON Document 1 Filed 11/16/11 Page 9 of 9

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, TERESA SEGO, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, TERESA SEGO, demands a jury trial in this

case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Date: 11-16-11

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID No. 57100

Tara L. Patterson

Attorney ID No. 88343

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email:

kimmel@creditlaw.com

Email:

tpatterson@creditlaw.com

21

22

23

24

25